



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

should be carried out, does not make it the less unconscionable, that she should hold her brother's land, conveyed to her under a family compact, made for their mutual benefit, which has failed of execution through default of neither of them, but of a third party. She accepted the land under the family arrangement; that arrangement has fallen through. The position of the complainant is of some consideration with the court. He was one of the heirs-at-law of Robert G. Johnson. He is not only a sufferer by the father's violation of the agreement, but without cause has been disinherited; and that, which in law and justice belonged to him by his double right as heir and by contract, is all, or nearly all, bestowed upon his sister and her children. Under such circumstances, to permit the sister to enjoy, without any consideration, a part of that inheritance which the complainant derived from his mother is unjust, and a court of equity ought to prevent it.

This relief the complainant is not entitled to under the present bill as it is framed. The demurrer is therefore well taken, and must be sustained with costs. The complainant is at liberty to amend his bill, if he sees proper, upon the usual terms, so as to adapt it to the views I have expressed and relief suggested.

**CERTIFIED DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF
CALIFORNIA, 1856.**

HEYDENFELDT, J.—The current of decisions of this court goes to establish that the policy of this State, as derived from her legislation, is to permit settlers, in all capacities, to occupy the public lands, and by such occupation to acquire the right of undisturbed enjoyment against all the world but the true owner.

In evidence of this, acts have been passed to protect the possession of agricultural lands acquired by mere occupancy; to license miners; to provide for the recovery of mining claims; recognizing canals and ditches which were known to divert the water of streams from their natural channels, for mining purposes; and others of like character.

This policy has been extended equally to all pursuits, and no partiality

for one over another has been evinced, except in the single case where the rights of the agriculturist is made to yield to those of the miner, when gold is discovered in his land. This exceptional privilege is, of course, confined to public lands, as we held in *Stokes vs. Barrett et al.*, at the last January term. The policy of the exception is obvious. Without it, the entire gold region might have been enclosed in large tracts, under the pretence of agriculture and grazing, and eventually what would have sufficed as a rich bounty to many thousands would be reduced to the proprietorship of a few.

Aside from this, the legislation and decisions have been uniform in according the right of peaceable enjoyment to the first occupant either of the land or anything incident to the land. In the case of *Irwin vs. Phillips*, at the January term, the question was as to the use of water, and it was decided upon the principle of prior occupancy.

The appellants insist that as the State has granted the franchise of digging gold, all the incidents necessary to that purpose, wood, water, &c., must follow. This is certainly the doctrine of the common law, and would be held decisive in this case, in the absence of any other right to contradict it. But in previous decisions we have shown that there is nothing sufficiently expressive in the character of our legislation, which warrants an invasion upon the already acquired rights of individuals, except in the single case of agricultural lands. In the case of *Stokes vs. Barrett*, we declared that "to authorize an invasion of private property in order to enjoy a public franchise, would require more specific legislation than any yet resorted to." In *Irwin vs. Phillips*, we say "that however much the policy of the State, as indicated by her legislation, has conferred the privilege to work the mines, it has equally conferred the right to divert the streams from their natural channels." And further, we say, "the miner who selects a piece of ground to work, must take it as he finds it, subject to prior rights, which have an equal equity on account of an equal recognition by the sovereign power."

In the case of *Fitzgerald vs. Urton*, at the July term, it appeared that a party of miners invaded, for mining purposes, a town lot built upon and used as a tavern and stable yard. The defendants there relied upon the statute which gives mining privileges upon public lands in the possession of others for agricultural and grazing purposes. In referring to that statute we say, "in permitting miners, however, to go upon public lands occupied by others, it has legalized what would otherwise have been a

trespass, and the act cannot be extended by implication to a class of cases not specially provided for."

It results, from the consideration we have given the case, that the right to mine for the precious metals can only be exercised upon the public lands; that although it carries with it the right, such as the use of wood and water, those incidents must also be of the public domain in like manner as the lands; that a prior appropriation of either to steady individual purpose, establishes a *quasi* private proprietorship which entitles the holder to be protected in its quiet enjoyment against all the world but the true owner, except in the single case provided to the contrary by the statute which I have already adverted to.

Upon the remaining point argued I have only to add, that the facts do not make out a license from the respondent to the appellants. It would be strange to take away a party's rights upon such slight grounds. *Turtar vs. The Spring Creek Water and Mining Company.*

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

COURT OF CLAIMS. REPORTS AND DIGEST OF OPINIONS, DELIVERED SINCE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COURT. By JOHN C. DEVEREUX, Counsellor at Law. New York: Banks, Gould & Co., 144 Nassau Street, 1856.

The Court of Claims having now been in successful operation for nearly two years, and having in the meantime been obliged to form its practice, and almost the very principles of law under which it is to work, has accumulated a respectable body of decisions, which are collected in the present volume. The materials of which the work is composed, consist of the recent report of the presiding judge of the court, to Congress, upon the character and extent of the business and operations of that court: a Digest of the opinions delivered, with some of the more important opinions given at large, and an Appendix, containing: I. A statement of the origin and history of the Court. II. The Acts of Congress relating thereto. III. The Rules of Court. IV., V. A List of Commissioners to take testimony; and of the Attorneys and Counsellors. VI. Some articles by the Reporter on the character, practices, and judicial powers of the court. The manner in which these materials are put together is, perhaps, somewhat loose, but we can recommend the book to such of our readers as have a share in the large and increasing business of the court, as being carefully prepared and in every respect a useful *vade mecum*.